



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/626,577	07/27/2000	Terrance A. Tomkow	17497-16	9588
7590 08/31/2010 FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP ELLSWORTH R. ROSTON HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90045				
EXAMINER TRAN, PHILIP B				
ART UNIT 2455		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 08/31/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/626,577

**Applicant(s)**

TOMKOW, TERRANCE A.

**Examiner**

Philip B. Tran

**Art Unit**

2455

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 115-121, 230-232, 234, 236 and 286-297 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 115-121, 230-232, 234, 236 and 286-297 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 115-121, 230-232, 234, 236 and 286-297 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Barkan** International Publication No. **WO 98/17042**, in view of “**Network Design Manual: Storing and Forwarding With SMTP and Message Transfer Agents**,” Feb 23, 1999 (Hereafter, NDM).

Regarding claim 115, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of transmitting a message from a sender to a destination address through a server displaced from the destination address [see Abstract], the steps at the server of:

receiving the message from the sender [see Abstract, p.23-24, step (h). p.19, step (b)],

transmitting the message to the destination address [see Abstract, p.12, steps (a, b, c), p.23-24, step (h), p.30, step (d)],

storing at the server at least a portion of a dialog (communication) generated during the transmission of the message between the server and the destination address [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.29-30, 31-32, 34],

receiving at the server an indication from the destination address that the message has been received at the destination address from the server [see Abstract, p.8, p.19, p.29, step c],

maintaining the message and additionally creating a digital signature of the message for later authentication of the message by the server [see p.9, p.31-32], and

transmitting to the sender the message, the digital signature of the message, and the at least a portion of the dialog (communication) before any authentication of the message for storage by the sender [see p.33, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, mail server 3 sends proof of receipt message and encrypted message from recipient (user 2) and stores in mail box 12 belonging to sender (user 1) and p.46].

Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

Regarding claim 116, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, the step at the server of: discarding the message and the digital signature of the message after the transmission of the message and the digital signature of the message to the sender and before any authentication of the message [see p.35, step 1].

Regarding claim 117, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including steps at the server of: receiving from the sender a copy of the message and the digital signature of the message before any authentication of the message but after the transmission of the message to the sender [see p.34, step j], generating digital fingerprints of the copy of the message from the sender [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.31-p.32], comparing the generated digital fingerprints to the digital signature of the message, and authenticating the message on the basis of the results of the comparison [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.31-p.32].

Regarding claim 118, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the steps at server of: providing at the server, at the same time an attachment including an identity of the sender and an identity and an address of the server and an identity and an destination address of the recipient [see p.23, 30], and additionally providing a digital signature of the attachment (generating a digital signature of the attachment), and transmitting to the sender the attachment and the digital signature of the attachment, at the same time as the transmission of

Art Unit: 2455

the message, and the digital signature of the message, to the sender [see p.23, 29-30, 34].

Regarding claim 119, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the steps at the server of: receiving an attachment from the destination address [see Abstract, p.8, p.19, p.29, step c], maintaining the attachment and additionally providing a digital signature of the attachment (providing at the server a digital signature of the attachment), and transmitting to the sender the attachment and the digital signature of the attachment for storage by the sender [see p.23, 29-30, 34].

Regarding claim 120, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the steps at the server of: receiving from the sender copies of the message and the attachment and the digital signature of the message and the attachment, generating digital fingerprints of the message and the attachment, comparing the digital fingerprints of the message to the digital signature of the message and comparing the digital fingerprints of the attachment to the digital signature of the attachment to authenticate the message and the attachment [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.29-30, 31-32, 34].

Regarding claim 121, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the steps at the server of: receiving the message and the verification (digital signature) of the message at the server from the sender, and authenticating the

Art Unit: 2455

message at the server on the basis of the message and the digital signature received by the server from the sender [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.29-30].

Regarding claim 230, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including a method of authenticating a message provided by a sender and transmitted to a destination server by a second server displaced from the sender and the destination server, the steps at the second server of:

creating an electronic attachment at the second server including the identity and address of the sender and the identity and address of the second server and the identity and address of the destination server and at least a portion of a dialog (communication) generated during the transmission of the message between the server and the destination server [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.29-30, 31-32, 34], and

transmitting the electronic attachment from the second server to the sender after the transmission of the message from the second server to the destination server but before any authentication of the message by the second server [see Abstract, p.12, steps (a, b, c), p.23-24, step (h), p.30, step (d), p.33, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, p.34].

Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 2455

the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

Regarding claim 231, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the at least portion of the dialog of the electronic attachment transmitted from the second server to the sender includes the address and the identity of intermediate stations receiving the electronic attachment in the transmission of the electronic message from the second server to the destination server [see p.44, step e].

Again, Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).



Regarding claim 232, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the steps at the second server of: providing a digital signature of the attachment at the second server, and transmitting the digital signature from the second server to the sender at the time of transmitting the attachment from the second server to the sender [see Abstract, p.12, steps (a, b, c), p.23-24, step (h), p.30, step (d), p.33, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, p.34].

Regarding claim 234, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the steps at the second server of: receiving the electronic attachment and the digital signature at the second server from the sender [see Abstract, p.12, steps (a, b, c), p.23-24, step (h), p.30, step (d), p.33, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, p.34], and authenticating the attachment at the second server on the basis of the electronic attachment and the digital signature of the electronic attachment received by the second server from the sender [see p.23-24, steps j-h, p.31-p.32].

Regarding claim 236, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the steps at the second server of: receiving at the second server the attachment, and the digital signature of the attachment from the sender [see Abstract, p.12, steps (a, b, c), p.23-24, step (h), p.30, step (d), p.33, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, p.34], providing at the second server digital fingerprints of the attachment, and comparing the digital fingerprints and the digital signature of the attachment to authenticate the attachment [see p.23-24, steps j-h, p.31-p.32].

Regarding claim 286, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the steps at the server of: receiving from the sender a copy of the message and the digital signature of the message after the transmission of the message to the destination address but before any authentication of the message [see P. 34, step j], and processing the message and the digital signature of the message to determine the authentication of the message [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p. 31-p32].

Regarding claim 287, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the step(s) of transmitting the at least a portion of the dialog to a storage means for subsequent production as proof of delivery of the message to the destination address [see Abstract, p.8, p.19, p.29, step c and p.33, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, mail server 3 sends proof of receipt message and encrypted message from recipient (user 2) and stores in mail box 12 belonging to sender (user 1)].

Again, Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a

Art Unit: 2455

capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

Regarding claim 288, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed above. However, **Barkan** does not explicitly teach the data exchanged between the server and the destination address may be via a selected one of mail transport protocols such as SMTP and ESMTP protocols. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

Regarding claim 289, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the dialog includes data between the server and the destination address including the identification of the server and the destination address and the identification of the message and an acknowledgement of the receipt of the message by the destination address [see p. 23, 29-30, 34].

Again, Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

Regarding claim 290, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed above. In addition, **Barkan** further teaches the data exchanged between the server and the destination address is used to establish that the message has been received at the destination address [see p.33, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, mail server 3 sends proof of receipt message and encrypted message from recipient (user 2) and stores in mail box 12 belonging to sender (user 1)].

Regarding claim 291, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed above. In addition, **Barkan** further teaches the authentication is provided as follows: generating at the server a digital fingerprint of the message received by the server from the sender, and comparing the digital fingerprints generated at the

Art Unit: 2455

server to the digital signature of the message [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.29-30, 31-32, 34].

Regarding claim 292, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the step(s) of storing the at least a portion of the dialog (communication) between the second server and the destination server for subsequent proof of delivery of the message by the second server to the destination server [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.29-30, 31-32, 34].

Again, Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

Regarding claim 293, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the dialog (communication) between the second server and the destination

Art Unit: 2455

server includes matter relating to the identities of the second server and the destination server and relating to the message [see p.23, 29-30, 34].

Again, Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

Regarding claim 294, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the at least a portion of the dialog (communication) between the second server and the destination server is included in the electronic attachment [see Abstract, p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.29-30, 31-32, 34].

Again, Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2455

the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

Regarding claim 295, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, including the dialog (communication) between the second server and the destination server includes an acknowledgement by the destination server that it has received the message [see Abstract, p.8, p.19, p29, step c and p.33, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph].

Again, Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

Regarding claim 296, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the at least a portion of the dialog (communication) includes data exchanged between the second server and the destination server during the transmission of the message between the second server and the destination server through stages between the second server and the destination server, and further includes the step of storing the at least a portion of the dialog (communication) between the second server and the destination server for subsequent proof of delivery of the message by the second server to the destination server [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.29-30, 31-32, 34].

Again, Barkan does not explicitly teach the dialog being provided via a selected mail transport protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).



Regarding claim 297, **Barkan** teaches the invention as claimed above. In addition, **Barkan** further teaches storing the at least a portion of the dialog (communication) between the second server and the destination server for subsequent proof of the delivery of the message by the second server to the destination server, wherein the dialog (communication) between the second server and the destination server includes matter relating to the identities of the second server and the destination server and relating to the message and wherein the dialog between the second server and the destination server is included in the electronic attachment [see p. 23-24, steps j-h, p.29-30, 31-32, 34].

However, **Barkan** does not explicitly teach the data exchanged (dialog) between the second server and the destination server being provided via a selected one of mail transport protocol such as SMTP or ESMTP protocol. NDM, in the same or similar field of endeavor, discloses a dialog as a list of commands and responses exchanged between a client and server using conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP [see NDM, 3 pages]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barkan and NDM to include the step of implementation of dialog between a client and a server using a conventional mail transport protocol such as SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) because it would have an efficient communications system that has a capability for users to send and attach various kinds of files to electronic mail (including electronic document certification, verification, digital signature).

***Other References Cited***

3. The following references cited by the examiner but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Assmann, U.S. Pat. No. 6,986,037.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 115-121, 230-232, 234, 236 and 286-297 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

5. A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. FAILURE TO RESPOND WITHIN THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE WILL CAUSE THE APPLICATION TO BECOME ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). EXTENSIONS OF TIME MAY BE OBTAINED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 37 CAR 1.136(A).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3991. The Group fax phone number is (571) 273-8300. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar, can be reached on (571) 272-4006.

Art Unit: 2455

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip B Tran/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455  
Aug 29, 2010